

**DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION  
PROCUREMENT DIVISION  
RECOMMENDATION OF AWARD**

**TO:** Kathy Harrington

**FROM:** Susie Smith

**DATE:** 10/05/2009

**EST. AMOUNT:** \$194,600.00 (2 yr contract)

**REQ:** ASA-10-021

**OVER 10% OF ESTIMATE**

**YES:** \_\_\_ **NO:** X

**AGENCY:** ASA/IN State Police

**DESCRIPTION:** Male/Female Duty Boot/Shoe

**TOTAL NUMBER OF SOLICITED VENDORS:** 213

**TOTALNUMBER OF INDIANA FIRMS SOLICITED:** 151

**TOTAL NUMBER OF MINORITY & WOMAN VENDORS SOLICITED:** MBE 11 WBE 11

**SMALL BUSINESS SET-A-SIDE:** No

**RECYCLED PRODUCTS SOLICITED:** No

**SECRETARY OF STATE:** All bidders are registered with the Secretary of State.

**SAVING AMOUNT OF SPLIT:** No split.

**MINORITY BUSINESS PARTICIPATION:** No If yes, percentage(s) \_\_\_ award amount: \$ \_\_\_

**WOMAN-OWNED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION:** No If yes, percentage(s) \_\_\_ award amount: \$ \_\_\_

**QUOTE/BIDS WERE RECEIVED FROM THE FOLLOWING VENDORS:**

<u>VENDOR</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>INDIANA FIRM</u>	<u>PREFERENCE CLAIMED</u>	<u>BUY AMERICAN</u>	<u>EVAL. AMOUNT</u>	<u># of No BIDS</u>
1. The Uniform House	\$Reverse Auction	Yes	IN SM Bus (15%)	No		0-4
2. Siegel's Corporation	\$Reverse Auction	Yes	IN Bus (5%)	No		0-4
3. Steven R Jenkins	\$Reverse Auction	Yes	IN SM Bus (15%)	Yes		2-4
4. Donley & Assco	\$Reverse Auction	Yes	IN Bus (5%)	Yes		2-4
5. Ray O'Herron	\$Reverse Auction	No		No		0-4
6. Gall's An Aramark Co	\$Reverse Auction	Yes	IN Bus (5%)	No		0-4
7. Award Excellence Co	\$Reverse Auction	No		No		2-4

**Reverse Auction Vendors Meeting Specifications**

\*\*\*\*\* **All pricing below excludes the oversize charges**\*\*\*\*\*

1. Donley & Assco	\$51,800.00	Yes	IN Bus (5%)	Yes	\$49,210.00	2-4
2. Steven R Jenkins	\$58,107.00	Yes	IN SM Bus (15%)	Yes	\$49,380.95	2-4
3. Siegel's Corporation	\$64,993.00	Yes	IN Bus (5%)	No	\$61,743.35	0-4
4. The Uniform House	\$65,100.00	Yes	IN SM Bus (15%)	No	\$55,335.00	0-4
5. Ray O'Herron	\$73,750.00	No		No	\$73,750.00	0-4

**Specifications:**

Specifications are satisfactory

**Delays:**

There were no delays in the processing.

**Preferences:** Per IC 5-22-15-7 – An offeror may claim one (1) of the types of preferences for which the offeror is eligible.

**US Manufactured-** Steven R Jenkins and Donley & Associates bid an alternate and claimed this preference. All other bidders bid the brand requested and said no to this preference. Indiana State Police stated the Duty Boot submitted by Steven R Jenkins and Donley & Associates (they bid the same manufacturer) didn't meet specifications but the alternate Duty Shoe met specifications. I am asking for an exception to this preference on lines 3 & 4 the female/male duty shoes to award to the low bidder for a savings of \$17,675.00, percentage .6587%, this excludes the pricing for the oversize charges, which the awarded vendor, The Uniform House, didn't participate in pricing for any of the overcharge charges.

**IN Business Preference-** Siegel's Corp and Donley & Associates claimed this preference. Claiming this preference didn't affect the award.

**IN SM Business Preference-** The Uniform House and Steven R Jenkins claimed this preference. Claiming this preference didn't affect the award on lines 1, 2, & 4, however, on line #3 the low bidder not claiming this preference bid an oversize charge and without knowing how many male duty shoes will be ordered in the oversize with a charge it cannot be determined if this preference affected the award on this line.

**Recommendation Narrative:**

Gall's, An Aramark Co, and Award Excellence weren't invited to the reverse auction as they provided pricing on their solicitation and no pricing is allowed on a reverse auction solicitation. As stated above, the alternate male/female duty boot and shoe was submitted to IN State Police for review and testing. IN State Police concluded the male/female duty boot didn't meet specifications but the male/female duty shoe did meet specifications and was allowed to participate in the reverse auction for the lines 3 & 4. A line was allotted for the bidders to submit an oversize charge and a line for the size of each female, male duty boot and shoe pertaining to the oversize charge. No bidders charged an oversize charge for the female or male duty boot. All bidders except The Uniform House submitted an oversize charge for the male duty shoe. Donley & Associates was the only bidder to submit an oversize charge for the female duty shoe.

Line 1) Male Duty Boot – Siegel's is the low bidder, however, The Uniform House claimed the IN SM Business Preference. Claiming this preference makes The Uniforms House the low responsive and responsible bidder meeting specifications. I recommend awarding to The Uniform House.

Line 2) Female Duty Boot- Siegel's is the low bidder, however, The Uniform House claimed the IN SM Business Preference. Claiming this preference makes The Uniforms House the low responsive and responsible bidder meeting specifications. I recommend awarding to The Uniform House.

Line 3) Male Duty Shoe- At this time it is unclear to determine the low bidder as Siegel's bid the oversize charge of \$3.00 for any shoe ordered for size 13 and over. The Uniform House didn't bid an oversize charge. Since we can't determine the low bidder due to the oversize charge we will determine the low bidder after applying preferences to the bid price without an oversize charge. The Uniform House claimed the IN SM Business Preference and claiming this preference makes them the low responsive and responsible bidder meeting specifications. I recommend awarding to The Uniform House.

Line 4) Female Duty Shoe- Siegel's is the low bidder, however, The Uniform House claimed the IN SM Business Preference. Claiming this preference makes The Uniforms House the low responsive and responsible bidder meeting specifications. I recommend awarding to The Uniform House.

**Split Award:** No Split, The Uniform House is lower on all lines.

Line #	QTY	Siegel Corp	EXT Amount	IN Bus Pref	Donley & Assoc	EXT Amount	IN Bus Ref	Steven R Jenkins	EXT Amount	Steven R Jenkins SM BUS	The Uniform House	EXT Amount	Uniform House sm bus	Ray O'Heron	EXT Amount
1	883.40		26544.00	25216.80							883.500	26550.00	22567.50	97.00	29100.00
	Oversize											0.00	0.00		0.00
2	885.48		4424.00	4202.80							885.500	4425.00	3761.25	97.00	4850.00
	Oversize											0.00	0.00		0.00
3	486.00		29160.00	27702.00	74.00	44400.00	42180.00	83.01	49806.00	42335.10	486.500	29250.00	24862.50	57.00	34200.00

O v e r s i z e	6 0 0	5 1 . 6 0	30960.00	29412.00	9 9 . 0 0	47400.00	45030.00	9 1 . 0 1	54606.00	46415.10	0.00	0.00	6 0 . 0 0	36000.00	
4	1 0 0	4 8 . 6 5	4865.00	4621.75	7 4 . 0 0	7400.00	7030.00	8 3 . 0 1	8301.00	7055.85	4 8 . 7 5 0	4875.00	4143.75	5 6 . 0 0	5600.00
O v e r s i z e	1 0 0		0.00	0.00	7 9 . 0 0	7900.00	7505.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	
w/oversize charges			95953.00	91155.35		107100.00	101745.00		112713.00	95806.05		65100.00	55335.00		109750.00
w/o oversize charges			64993.00	61743.35		51800.00	49210.00		58107.00	49390.95		65100.00	55335.00		73750.00

**Award Recommendation:**

**VENDOR**

The Uniform House

**ITEMS**

ALL

**AMOUNT**

\$65,100.00

(As applicable to signature authority)

*Servie Smith 10/5/09*  
Procuring Agent/Procurement Division/Date

*Katherine S. Harrington, CPPB*  
Approval/Date&yr  
10-06-09